

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/935,995	_	08/23/2001	Richard E. Smalley	11321-P014US	1538	
47744	7590	7590 09/09/2005		EXAMINER		
ROSS SPI		ARSSON EST & MINICK P.C.	LE, HOA T			
P. O. BOX		LDI & MINICKI.C.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS,	TX 7520	1		1773		
				DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W-			
7	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/935,995	SMALLEY ET AL	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	H. T. Le	1773	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appriod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence addr	oss
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO o, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this commoderate the commoderate of the commo	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 Ju	une 2005.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	•	•	nerits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	•
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 36-59 and 61-65 is/are pending in the	• •		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>36-59 and 61-65</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
pplication Papers		•	
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•	• •	•
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO	<i>-</i> 152.
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority document2. Certified copies of the priority document		Application No.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			lane
application from the International Bureau	•	. 10001704 III tilis Hativiiai St	uye
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received.	
	•		
ttachment(s)	_		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Informal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/2005</u> .	6) 🔲 Other:		•

Application/Control Number: 09/935,995

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what "portion" in the phrases "the first portion of the polymer" and "the second portion of the polymer" denotes.

Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments, filed June 2005, with respect to the validity of the prior art (the Star article) applied in the last office action, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection based on the Start reference has been withdrawn.
- 4. However, a new grounds of rejection are made as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.



Art Unit: 1773

6. Claims 36-43, 45-59, 63 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Davey patent (EP 0 949 199).¹

Claim 36: See the Davey patent, page 3, paragraph 0012 and claims 11 and 13.

Claims 37-38: See Davey, page 3, paragraph 0012 and page 6, par. 0052.

Claims 39-40: See Davey, page 3, paragraph 0016 and claim 14.

Claim 41: met by inherency.

Claims 42-43: See claim 12.

Claim 45: See Davey, page 4, paragraph 0026; page 3, paragraphs 0021 to 0023 (solvent);

page 4, par. 0024 (sonication mixing).

Claim 46: See page 4, par. 0031.

Claim 47: See Davey, page 3, paragraph 0018.

Claims 48-49: Page 4, par. 0026.

Claim 50: page 3, par. 0017 (line 40), par. 0018 and par. 0021.

Claim 51: page 4, par. 0040.

Claims 52-54: These claims are product-by-process claims; therefore, only product limitations are given patentable consideration. The burden is on applicants to prove that the difference in process results in a different product.

Claims 55-58: Page 4, par. 0036-0039.

Claim 59: See Davey, page 3, paragraph 0012 and page 6, par. 0052.

¹ Copy of this reference has been provided by Applicants.

Application/Control Number: 09/935,995 Page 4

Art Unit: 1773

Claim 63: Page 7, line 23 where blending the coated carbon nanotube with a polymer matrix is taught.

Claim 65: See the Davey patent, page 3, paragraph 0012; and claims 11 and 13.

7. Claims 36, 44 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the Grimes article ("The 500 MHz to 5.50 GHz complex permittivity spectra of single-wall carbon nanotube-loaded polymer composites").²

The Grimes article teach the coating of polymer, particularly poly-ethyl-methacrylate, on a carbon single-walled nanotube.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 44 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Davey patent (EP 0 949 199) as applied to claims 36-43, 45-59, 63 and 65 above, and further in view of the discussion below.

Claim 44: The Davey patent teaches conjugated, non-conjugated or coiling polymers that can be used as the coating polymer for the carbon nanotube (page 3, par. 0013 and 0016). Though the patent does not explicitly name the polymers, the polymers as recited in instant claim 44 are encompassed within the broad teaching of Davey. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to select polymers as claimed because these polymers are capable of coiling or forming strands or ropes as suggested by the Davey. Claim 64: At page 7, paragraph 0060, the Davey patent teaches incorporation of the polymer-coated carbon nanotube in resins, polymer matrix and plastics to form various

² Copy of this reference has been provided by Applicants.

Application/Control Number: 09/935,995 Page 5

Art Unit: 1773

products. Therefore, based on this broad teaching of Davey, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to select polymers as claimed because they are suitable as resins and plastics that form products suggested by Davey at page 7, paragraph 0060.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to H. T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1511. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., Mondays to Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

H. T. Le Primary Examiner Art Unit 1773